

Derry News, and recently negotiated the purchase of the Haverhill Gazette.

When the Eagle-Tribune outgrew its original headquarters in downtown Lawrence, he opened a modern plant in North Andover and became a pioneer in the use of photos, color graphics, and bold newspaper design, while insisting that his newspaper maintain traditional standards of fairness and language.

He was devoted, generous, and always available to his 400 employees. When the newspapers of New England were hit by a brutal recession in the early 1990s, advertising revenues declined and newsprint costs soared. Mr. Rogers was a rarity. He never issued a layoff notice.

He also showed an unwavering commitment to his private charity. He was a generous benefactor to so many important institutions in the Merrimack Valley led by the Rogers Family Foundation: the Lawrence Boys and Girls Club, Merrimack College, the United Way, Holy Family Hospital, Lawrence General Hospital, St. Mary's Church, the American Cancer Society, St. Michael's Church, and countless other community organizations. Every year, the Eagle-Tribune Santa Fund provides hundreds of thousands of dollars for the needy at Christmas.

Mr. Rogers was a friend to presidents and governors and leaders of industry. Despite his great influence, he was an unassuming man. He walked his dog every morning, he lunched at the Lantern Brunch in Andover, and fished off Seabrook Beach and Gloucester. His priority was always his wife Jacqueline and children Chip, Debbie, Marty and Steve, along with his grandchildren, and the nieces and nephews left by his brother, Allan B. Rogers, a former Eagle-Tribune editor who died in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known Irving Rogers as a friend and admired him as a leader in our community. My wife Ellen and I extend our deepest sympathies to him and his family.

1990 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on the Census held a hearing on the 1990 census, and once again, the record is full of mistakes. Let me, once again, put the facts on the table so that Congress can make its decisions on what really happened.

Some of the errors at the hearing are because most of the members and staff on the Republican side are new to the issue, and get confused about which facts apply to 1990 and which to previous censuses. Some of the errors occurred because two of the three statisticians who testified had no previous experience with the census undercount issue. It is often useful to get fresh minds to think about a problem, but in this case it also resulted in people making statements when they did not have the facts to support their position.

At last week's hearing the statement was made that in 1990 50 percent of the undercount came from problems in the address list. That is wrong. The facts are that in 1990 70 percent of those missed were in households that were counted, and the address list was 97.5 percent accurate.

One of the witnesses criticized the Post Enumeration Survey because it put more people into the census than other methods said were missing. That too is wrong. The problem with the Post Enumeration Survey in 1990 was that despite the Census Bureau's best efforts, it will miss people. In 1990 the Post-Enumeration Survey showed that the census net undercount was 1.6 percent, while the Census Bureau's Demographic Analysis, which they have done since 1940, showed an undercount rate of 1.8 percent.

Finally, one witness said that after the 2000 census there would be no Demographic Analysis. That is just wrong.

These are not all of the mistakes made at that hearing, but they do illustrate the point that new-comers to this issue are having a hard time understanding the facts. What I find more troubling is the intentional misrepresentation of information.

At last week's hearing the majority tried to suggest that the 1990 census was actually better than the 1980 census. To do that they took the measure of the undercount of Blacks from Demographic analysis in 1980 and compared it to the Post Enumeration Survey estimate of undercount for Blacks for 1990. I would hope that our Subcommittee Chairman is a good enough statistician to know that is wrong. In 1980, Demographic Analysis shows that the undercount of Blacks was 4.5 percent. In 1990 it was 5.7 percent. The Post Enumeration Survey shows a lower undercount for Blacks because even after the Census Bureau's best efforts, the survey still misses some people.

Unfortunately, it wasn't bad enough that the majority tried to minimize the fact that the census misses millions of poor and minorities. What they are really concerned about is that the Census Bureau may take out the millions of people who are counted twice. On the one hand they are saying that they don't care that millions of Blacks, and Hispanics and Asians and the poor are left out of the census. At the same time they are saying, don't you dare take out any of those white suburbanites who were counted twice in my district.

Following the 1990 census, there was a broad and bipartisan consensus that we had to find a better way to conduct the census—to improve the accuracy of the counts and to control the cost. For several years, while experts toiled over alternative methods and the Census Bureau threw its energies into research, Republican in Congress paid little attention. In fact, the appropriators kept prodding the Census Bureau to move more quickly to develop a plan for a better census.

It was not until consultants working for the Republican National Committee decided that the use of sampling methods to help fix the problem of undercounting might hurt Republicans in the redistricting process that the party leaders stood up and took notice. All of a sudden, scientific methods that the National Academy of Sciences, the General Accounting Office, and the Commerce Department's Inspector General had recommended a few years earlier, were no good. They were "unscien-

tific" according to a report pushed through by the majority of the Government Reform Committee. All of a sudden, the National Academy of Science was politically biased, and the Census Bureau incapable of conducting a census. Even the Speaker of the House changed his position on the issue. In 1991 he supported adjustment. In 1996 he did a 360 degree turn around.

Now, I ask you: Is there any basis for the strong and sudden opposition to the use of scientific sampling methods in the 2000 census among Republicans, other than their concern that a more accurate count of African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans and poor people might somehow work to their disadvantage when political district boundaries are drawn.

Let's not try to fool the American people with talk about the efficacy of choosing this post-stratification variable or that. All of this minutiae is meant to do one thing only: to confuse the American people, to make them think the Census Bureau isn't capable of honest, to undermine public confidence in the entire census process. All because Republican leaders believe that their hold on political power will slip if the census more accurately reflects the true composition of our diverse population.

How utterly irresponsible! How utterly devoid of any shred of moral imperative. I ought to be angry or outraged. Instead I am genuinely saddened. Saddened because one of the most fundamental activities of our democratic system of governance is being belittled and diminished for partisan political advantage. The census and the Census Bureau may forever be tarnished by this organized effort to tear down the messenger because some people don't like the message.

This is a sad day and a low point for this Congress. I hope my Republican colleagues will look within themselves before they continue on their campaign of terror against science in general, and the Census Bureau in particular. I hope they will decide if they really want to live with the consequences of their plan to ensure that the 2000 census will continue to miss millions of people and that the Census Bureau will be diminished in the eyes of the public.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE MEASURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support additional trade measures important to the agriculture community.

On Tuesday of this week, just several days ago, I outlined broad trade issues that need to be addressed for U.S. farmers and ranchers. These include opening new markets, using our existing trade tools, and removing damaging sanctions that penalize the American producer.

Tonight I would like to cite a specific example of where our trade tools and policy should be used. The U.S. wheat gluten industry has a long-standing battle with the European Union regarding the EU's excessive subsidies and market-distorting trade barriers.

After several devastating years after which European imports rose substantially, the gluten industry took their case to the International Trade Commission, claiming that there had been substantial damage to the industry as a result of subsidized imports.

Following the presentation of evidence from both sides, the ITC ruled unanimously in favor of the U.S. gluten producers and recommended specific remedies that the U.S. should implement. These recommendations are now before President Clinton, who ultimately must decide whether or not to fight this fight for U.S. agriculture.

The decision before the President regarding the implementation of these GATT legal remedies is important not only for the wheat gluten industry but for all of agriculture. When Members of Congress, when I am asked to decide how to vote on the fast track, on MFN, or other trade-related legislation, I need assurance, we need assurance that our current trade problems under existing agreements will be aggressively pursued by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President of the United States to act on behalf of American agriculture and to enforce the recommendations of the ITC for the wheat gluten industry.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 12:15 a.m.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 12:15 a.m.

□ 0015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-547) on the resolution (H. Res. 445) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION DISPOSING OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1150, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 105-548) on the resolution (H. Res. 446) disposing of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:00 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of attending the 25th National Reunion of American Prisoners of War.

Mr. WICKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for Today after 3:30 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of attending daughter's high school graduation.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 7:30 p.m. on account of physical reasons.

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 8:30 p.m. And the balance of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SERRANO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MOLLOHAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SANCHEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ISTOOK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BRADY of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SERRANO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. KIND.
Ms. NORTON.
Mr. HALL of Ohio.
Mr. MILLER of California in two instances.

Mr. NEAL.
Mrs. CAPPS.
Mr. MURTHA.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. MCGOVERN.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. THOMPSON.
Ms. BROWN of Florida.
Mr. CONDIT.
Ms. LOFGREN.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. DEFAZIO.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. KUCINICH.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
Ms. STABENOW.
Mr. SABO.
Mr. SHERMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKEON.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Ms. DUNN.
Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. MCKEON.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. EWING.
Mr. BRADY of Texas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2472. An act to extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

H.R. 3301. An act to amend chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the Treasury greater discretion with regard to the placement of the required inscriptions on quarter dollars issued under the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3301. An act to amend chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the Treasury greater discretion with regard to the placement of the required inscriptions on quarter dollars issued under the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program.

H.R. 2472. An act to extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.